



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR        | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/549,936   | 09/20/2005  | Jordi Tormo i Blasco        | 5000-0133PUS1       | 7901             |
| 2292 7590 03/18/2008<br>BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH<br>PO BOX 747<br>FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 |             |                             |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER<br>RAO, DEEPAK R  |             |                             |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT<br>1624   |             | PAPER NUMBER                |                     |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE<br>03/18/2008  |             | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 10/549,936             | I BLASCO ET AL.     |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | Deepak Rao             | 1624                |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) Deepak Rao.

(2) Mr. Thomas Siepmann, Applicant's Representative.

**Status of Application:** After Non-final Rejection

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 3 March 2008

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

103 rejection

**Claims discussed:**

1, 3

**Prior art documents discussed:**

Dow

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Applicant submitted translation/certified copy of foreign priority document to overcome the reference. Examiner indicated that the priority document does not fully support the definitions of L and R3 in claims 1 and 3. Specifically, the term 'L' as defined in the instant claims contains 'nitro, -C(=S)-N(A)A, and -C(=NA)-SA' and R3 contains '-C(=S)-NRaRb' which terms are not present in the priority document. Mr. Siepmann indicated that the claims will be amended such that the claims 1 and 3 are consistent with the priority document. Additionally, Mr. Siepmann indicated that new claim(s) may be added to cover the terms deleted from claim 1, as the reference of record does not include the above terms. Examiner indicated that a supplemental amendment (with the changes discussed) may be filed for further consideration.*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Deepak Rao/  
 Primary Examiner  
 Art Unit 1624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

